

**Amendment to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings includes applicant's copy of the sheet containing Figure 2 and a sheet showing changes to Figure 9, and a replacement sheet for the sheet containing Figure 9. Please note that Applicant's copy of Figure 2 does not have a misspelling. The Examiner's copy appears to have had letters accidentally removed. The substitute page should cure this.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the specification, the abstract has been amended to reduce it to less than 150 words.

Claims 1, 6, 15, 20, 21, and 29 - 42 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner, with the minor exceptions that in claims 1 and 15, the indefinite article "a" has been added before "3D volumetric image" for better syntax, and except where the suggested corrections have been made to claim 35 when made independent. Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 1, claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 15 and 20, and claim 35 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 29 and 34.

The objection to Figure 2 of the drawings is believed caused by a poor copy in the application as filed. Attached is a copy from applicant's file for use in the application, and in which the phrase "Cent r of R tati n" is shown correctly as "Center of Rotation.

The objection to Figure 9 is believed obviated by the replacement sheet for Figure 9 wherein lead line 26 has been added.

The objections to the claims in paragraph 3 are believed to be obviated by the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of Claims 1 – 5, 15 – 19, and 29 – 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oikawa (US Patent 6,411,674) in view of Griffith (US Patent 5,319,550) is respectfully traversed. Without conceding anything about the reasons for the rejection of the dependent claims, the basis for the rejection of claims 1, 15, and 29 is fundamentally flawed. It is based on a contention that Figure 14 shows the object rotated about an axis of rotation at a canted angle with respect to the image plane, but just the opposite is shown. See the description at column 13, lines 41 – 55, to wit:

"In the above embodiments, although change of the Laminographic angle .alpha. is carried out by varying the inclination angle of the X-ray irradiation axis with respect to the rotating axis ra of the subject,

a modified example may be made wherein the change of the Laminographic angle  $\alpha$  is carried out by varying the inclination angle of the rotation axis  $r_a$  of the subject M with respect to the X-ray irradiation axis  $X_a$ , as shown in FIG. 14. In the apparatus according to the modified example, in case the inclination angle of the rotation axis  $r_a$  is changed, an inclined state of the detecting surface  $D_a$  of the sheet-type X-ray detector D as shown by a single dotted chain line in FIG. 14 is required to be corrected to an orthogonal state as shown by a solid line in FIG. 14." (Emphasis added)

The underscored material demonstrates, as also shown by the rotated surface  $D_a$  in figure 14, that the axis of rotation of Oikawa's object is not at a canted angle with respect to the image plane, as required by applicant's claims, but instead is at a canted angle with respect to the X-ray irradiation axis  $X_a$ . Indeed, Oikawa specifically changes the inclination state of the detecting surface  $D_a$  so that it remains orthogonal to the object's axis of rotation. Therefore, Oikawa purposefully avoids the claimed configuration.

The remaining rejections all depend on Oikawada teaching what it doesn't teach, none of the citations, nor Griffith or Ning, teach the claim limitation of rotating the object about an axis of rotation at a canted angle with respect to the image plane.

The Examiner is thanked for stating that claims 7 – 14, 21 – 28, and 35 – 42 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. That has been done by the above amendment. In view of the foregoing, Applicant believe the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance.

Dated: January 4, 2005

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
865 South Figueroa Street, 29<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2576  
(213) 892-9237  
(213) 680-4518 (Facsimile)

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert Berliner  
Registration No.: 20,121  
Attorneys for Applicant